



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,893	09/19/2000	John Michael Everson	30604	5121

7590 06/30/2004
STEVEN J. FUNK
SPRINT LAW DEPARTMENT
6391 Sprint Parkway
Overland Park, KS 66251

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	5

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/664,893

Applicant(s)

EVERSON ET AL.

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment, Paper No. 4, filled on April 13, 2004. No claims have been cancelled or added. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 10 have been amended. Presently pending claims are 1 – 12.

Response to Argument

2. Applicant's argument filled on April 13, 2004, Paper No. 4 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

2.1 Regarding amended independent claim 1, the applicant argued that the cited prior art (CPA) [Russell Patent Number 5,455,953] does not describe a "dynamic session tracking system". This argument is not found persuasive. Russell discloses the connection mechanism in creating and deleting sessions between clients and servers in response to corresponding calls by the clients, wherein such connection mechanisms tracks the number of requests by the clients. When a session is established, a Server that is involved in the session tracks the number of explicit and implicit calls or requests (Column 4 lines 64 – Column 13 line 10).

The applicant argued that the CPA does not disclose, "Storing at least a portion of the Session ID on the user's computer". This argument is not found persuasive. Russell discloses storing at least a portion of the Session ID on the user's computer (Column 5 lines 35 – 53). Furthermore, Russell describes sessions associated with connections between a server and a user, with each user managing and storing the session ID information through Connection Data Structures and a set of Session Data Structures (Fig. 1 and Column 4 line 61 – Column 5 line 26).

The applicant argued that the CPA does not disclose, "Storing the object in a directory coupled with the authorization server". This argument is not found persuasive. Russell discloses a method and an apparatus (system) wherein the user information including the user access rights are stored in user profile database (Column 21 lines 64 – Column 22 line 50). Furthermore, Russell discloses receiving at an authorization server coupled with the user profile database log-in information from user (Column 3 line 64 – Column 4 line 9; Column 23 line 51 – Column 24 line 13). Authorization server receives login information, user access information and stores the information (Column 23 lines 1 – 9).

The applicant argued that the CPA does not disclose "writing information to the directory". This argument is not found persuasive. Russell discloses storing (writing) the information to the directory (Column 23 Lines 1 – 3). Furthermore, Russell describes

writing user access and authorization information to the directory (Column 3 lines 36 – 57).

The applicant argued that the CPA does not disclose “Comparing authentication credentials to static directory information”. This argument is not found persuasive. Russell describes comparing authentication credentials when a user log-in to system with the authorization server, wherein the Authorization server compares authentication credentials in the Directory server (static directory) information (Column 22 lines 2 – 11).

The applicant argued that the CPA does not disclose “Permitting other computer applications launched by the user to reference the session ID”. This argument is not found persuasive. Russell discloses permitting other computer applications launched by the user to reference the Session ID (Column 24 lines 62 – 67). Russell describes sessions associated with connections between a server and a user, with each user managing and storing the session ID information through Connection Data Structures and a set of Session Data Structures (Fig. 1 and Column 4 line 61 – Column 5 line 26). Furthermore, Russell describes permitting other computer applications launched by the user to reference the Session ID by generating calls to server through connections and maintaining the session identifier (SSID) (Column 12 line 43 – Column 13 line 15).

Regarding amended dependent claims 4 and 10, the applicant has amended a method for session ID based on machine information rather than account codes.

Russell discloses the Session ID being based on at least one of the following:

a date on which the computer user launched the computer application; a time in which the computer user launched the computer application; a TCP/IP address of the computer user; and a user name of the computer (Column 22 lines 2 – 31; Column 23 lines 51 and Column 18 lines 40 – 46).

Regarding amended dependent claims 2 and 8, the applicant has responded that the indicated text (Column 22 lines 2 – 6), discusses user look-up for authentication, not storage and maintenance of session information. The indicated text discusses look-up for user authentication with stored object in the directory. Furthermore, Russell teaches and describes the security information including authentication and authorization information (Column 21 line 48 – Column 23 line 29).

Applicant clearly has failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts. Therefore, the examiner respectfully asserts that CPA does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1 and 7. Dependent claims 2 - 4 and 8 – 10 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in this office action (Paper No.5).

2.2 Regarding Cited Prior Arts (CPA) Russell and Hartman patents, the applicant argued that they do not teach or suggest every element and feature of the claims. This argument is not found persuasive. Russell teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user. The client information including client access rights are stored in the directory server which are access by the authentication server to authorize a client to access the applications and services. Hartman teaches and describes a method and system for a placing a purchase order via a communication network that includes a server system, client system, wherein the shopping cart provides a conventional capability to add items to a shopping cart. The server system stores both client information and shopping cart information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the claimed invention by including a method for creating and storing a shopping cart as taught by Hartman, along with the object in the directory to eliminate the need to maintain separate access control systems as taught by Russell.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 11, the applicant argued that the cited prior art (CPA) [Russell Patent Number 5,455,953 in view of Hartman Patent Number 5,960,411] do not disclose “a method to include a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with the object in the directory”. This argument is not found persuasive. Hartman discloses a method and system for storing the shopping cart along with the client object directory (Fig. 1A, 2; Column 3 line 37 – Column 4 line 58 and Column 5 line 56 – Column 6 line 21).

Regarding dependent claims 6 and 12, the applicant argued that the cited prior art (CPA) [Russell Patent Number 5,455,953 in view of Hartman Patent Number 5,960,411] do not disclose "the steps of allowing the user to select items and storing the selected items in the shopping cart". This argument is not found persuasive. Russell teaches and describes a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user. Hartman discloses a method and system to include a step of allowing the user select items and storing information relating to the selected items in the shopping cart (Fig. 1A #103; Column 2 line 51 – Column 3 line 7 and Column 3 line 59 – Column 4 lines 24).

Applicant clearly has failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts. Therefore, the examiner respectfully asserts that CPA does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1 and 7. Dependent claims 5 – 6 and 11 – 12 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in this office action (Paper No.5).

Accordingly, rejections for claims 1 – 12 are respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 – 4 and 7 - 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Russell (U.S. Patent NO. 5,455,953).

As per Claims 1 and 7, Russell teaches a method for dynamically tracking a user session in order to authenticate and authorize a computer user (Column 4 lines 64 – Column 13 line 10), the method comprising the steps of:

Storing security information for users in a user profile database; Receiving at an authorization server coupled with the user profile database log-in information from user (Col. 21 Lines 64 – 67).

Creating a Session ID on user's computer; storing the Session ID on the user's computer (Col. 5 Lines 35 – 40 and Lines 44 – 53).

Creating an object associated with the computer user or the Session ID (Col. 8 Lines 8 – 16).

Stores the object in a directory coupled with the authorization server (Col. 23 Lines 1 – 3).

Copying the security information from the user profile database to the object in the directory (Col. 22 Lines 47 – 50).

Comparing the log-in information to the security information to authenticate or authorize the user (Col. 22 Lines 5 – 6).

Permitting other computer applications launched by the user to reference the Session ID (Col. 24 Lines 62 – 67).

As per Claims 2 and 8, Russell teaches a method for Security information including authentication and authorization (Column 21 line 48 – Column 23 line 29).

As per Claims 3 and 9, Russell teaches a method for the authentication and authorization information includes user-id, passwords (Fig. 7 Log-in Name, 220; Password, 236; Authenticator, 222; Authorization Server 216).

As per Claims 4 and 10, Russell teaches a method for Session ID based on one of the following:

a date on which the computer user launched the computer application; a time in which the computer user launched the computer application; a TCP/IP address of the computer user; and an user name of the computer user (Col. 10 Lines 66 – 67; Column 22 lines 2 – 31; Column 23 lines 51 and Column 18 lines 40 – 46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5 - 6 and 11 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell (U S Patent No. 5,455,953) in view of Hartman al. (U S Patent No. 5,960,411).

As per Claims 5 and 11, even though Russell teaches limitations of Claim 1 and Claim 7, Russell does not disclose a method wherein the steps include creating a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with the object in the directory. However, Hartman discloses a method to include a shopping cart (Fig. 1A) and storing the shopping cart along with the object in the directory (Col. 3 Lines 37 – 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the claimed invention by including a method for creating and storing a shopping cart along with the object in the directory to eliminate the need to maintain separate access control systems for each applications as taught by Russell. Such modifications would have been obvious because by combining the teachings of Russell with Hartman, the directory server has no need to contact multiple applications servers' thereby saving time in checking the user access rights.

As per Claims 6 and 12, Hartman discloses a method to include the steps of allowing the user to select items (Fig. 1A #102) and storing information relating to the selected items in the shopping cart (Col. 3 Lines 59 – 64 and Col. 4 Lines 19 – 24).

Conclusion

5. Rejections for Claims 1 – 12 are maintained.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or
faxed to: (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.


Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 703-
305-8912. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-
3900.

Pramila Parthasarathy
Patent Examiner
703-305-8912
June 25, 2004.


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
PRIMARY EXAMINER